

REMARKS

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abdelnur et al., (US patent 6,429,882, hereinafter “Abdelnur”). Claims 2-8, 11-18, 22-29 and 34-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abdelnur in view of Friedman et al. (U.S. patent 6,167,455, hereinafter “Friedman”). Claims 9, 10 and 30-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abdelnur in view of Matsutsuka (US patent application 2002/0026447, hereinafter “Matsutsuka”). Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abdelnur in view of Weber et al. (US patent 6,889,180, hereinafter “Weber”). Claims 1, 18 and 35-38 have been amended. No new matter has been added via this amendment.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On October 18, 2007, Examiner Omar Abdul-Ali and Applicants’ undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, participated in a telephonic interview. During the interview, Mr. Eiferman proposed the claim amendments herein. Examiner Abdul-Ali agreed to reevaluate the pending rejections in light of the claim amendments and remarks herein.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-17 and 35-38 were rejected under U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent claim 1 has been amended to now recite in part “A system embodied in a computer readable storage medium”. As amended it is believed that claim 1 and claims 2-17 which depend on claim 1 are believed to recite statutory subject matter given that the system is embodied in a tangible medium. Claims 35-38 have been amended to now recite a “computer-readable **storage** medium” which is believed to overcome the noted rejection given that claims 35-38 now claim structural subject matter. As amended, claims 1-17 and 35-38 are believed to be in condition to overcome the noted rejection.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abdelnur. Claims 2-8, 11-18, 22-29 and 34-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abdelnur in view of Friedman. Claims 9, 10 and 30-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abdelnur in view of Matsutsuka. Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abdelnur in view of Weber.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite in part, **“binding an object representing the target to an underlying model object of an underlying application logic representing a collection of underlying state by a source object and a query path”**. Support for this amendment can be found at least in paragraphs [0033], [0036] and discussion relating to FIG. 6. Applicants agree as noted in paragraph 3 of the office action that the Abdelnur reference fails to explicitly disclose a data binding engine that receives and evaluates the binding statement, but, however, disagree that one [of ordinary skill] would have been motivated to include a data binding engine receiving the binding statement in order to process the instructions created to bind commands with elements. As discussed in Col.8, line 51 to Col. 9, line 53 Abdelnur uses an editor which requires program code and changes to the code if the target is modified as discussed in the background section of the current application. Abdelnur as well as the other cited references taken individually or in combination fail to teach or suggest the above noted limitation of an object representing the target is bound to the an underlying model object of an underlying application logic representing a collection of underlying state by a source object and a query path. This reduces the complexity level and the need for technical expertise in command binding and routing. Given the above, it is believed that independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance, as well as dependent claims 2-17 which add further nonobvious limitations.

Independent method claim 18 has been amended in similar fashion to claim 1 and is thus also believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments. Dependent claims 19-34 which add further nonobvious limitations to claim 18 are also believed to be in condition for allowance. Independent claim 35 has also been amended in similar fashion to claim 18 and is also believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the

DOCKET NO.: 307339.01 / MSFT-3490
Application No.: 10/882,910
Office Action Dated: June 26, 2007

PATENT

above comments. Dependent claims 36-38 which depend on claim 35 are also believed to be in condition for allowance given that they add further nonobvious limitations to claim 35.

DOCKET NO.: 307339.01 / MSFT-3490
Application No.: 10/882,910
Office Action Dated: June 26, 2007

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: October 26, 2007

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman

Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439